

App. F. IX-4

### Previous References

1928.

**File No.** 6-5

**Serial Nos.** 1-12

## References

5-28, 13 974

120-28,1-2

44-22-70(1-2)

104-29-1-S

General and Revenue Secretariat.

182-24

~~DP~~

21

Part B for *Sep 28*

**SUBJECT**

7. 228. 29. in der oirt leut- nup me  
Malle fowta d. K. an fowta d. h. de.

(10) the contract is liable to revocation by 6 months notice on either side and shall ipso facto determine on irregularity or fraud by agents (clauses 13 & 14)

(11) all disputes and differences between the parties should be settled by arbitration (clause 16).

Sales arrangements in London.

The arrangement from the very commencement was that the oil was to be delivered to the agents at the chief distributing centres (vide P.1 and X. clauses 3 & 4 & P.14). The agents had to receive the consignments, warehouse them and sell them. It has been contended in this case that Mr. Mavlankar was in independent charge of these arrangements with the knowledge of the Director on behalf of the Government. vide para (2) of the accused's statement. It was also argued that the agents in virtue of the authority implied in them by the ordinary custom of the trade (Section 190 Indian Contract Act) acting with due diligence (Section 195) properly appointed a sub-agent with the knowledge of the principal (Section 192) and that the sub-agent therefore became the agent (Section 194). There is however abundant evidence to establish that Mr. Mavlankar was not a sub-agent for the kandal oil business but only a foreign correspondent in charge of the branch office of the Essoilour Co. in London. A branch office of the agents is the agency itself and not a subagency. After the Essoilour Products Co. took over the agency and Mr. Sitharaman took charge of the business in London the letter-heads were changed from that of M. Mavlankar to the Essoilour Products Co. London (compare Exh.B.21 of 1922 with P.66 of Sept. 1923). All the letter-heads subsequent to 1st September 1923 were those of the London branch office of the Essoilour Co. Vide P.66, P.73, P.74, P.84, P.361, P.362. See Mr. Varamaniam and Sitharaman referred to it as their office in several letters vide D.26, D.28, D.29, P.4.

## GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

## NOTES.

File No. 6

## FILE HEADING.

O.S. 1 of 28.28 in the District Court, Mysore  
 Kalle, Ponda v Navie Ponda & Chief Secy

The District Judge, Mysore

|         |               |                          |
|---------|---------------|--------------------------|
| No. 198 | Dated 25.7.28 | Received 27.7.28         |
| ary No. | 493           | Enclos. one Spare copies |
|         |               | Serial No.               |

## BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

forwards a copy of the plaint in the above case  
 which sta. dated to 13<sup>th</sup> August 1928 and requests

## NOTES AND ORDERS.

The suit is for possession of 60 acres of culturable  
 and 130 acres of unculturable gonad lands of the "B"  
 block of Rangapur Anvita Mahal Kaval, Javagal Hobli  
 Anvite Taluk, granted to the plaintiffs on 21<sup>st</sup> 11<sup>th</sup> 1884  
 by means of a ~~deed~~ <sup>deed</sup> dated 2-2-22 as per order

Mr. Mavliankar has treated himself as a branch-manager by signing letters with the designation 'for pre Essenflour Products Co. Ltd.' vide D.195 and D.198. In his letter Ext.D.28 dated the 15th December 1925 Mr. Vardhamania wrote to the Director of Sandal oil factories "our London Office have written to us etc." Accordingly we find Mr. Narasim Rao always addressing Mr. Mavliankar as 'The Essenflour Products Co. Ltd. 6-8 Beauchamp street London.' vide P.42, P.43, P.44, D.45, D.88, D.150, D.161, D.237, D.243 etc. He always addressed the London branch of the Essenflour Products Co. Ltd. and not the sub-agent. The Eastern Bank addressed this office as 'Messrs. Essenflour Products Co. Ltd. 6 to 8 Beauchamp street London E.C. vide P.184. Messrs. Coutts & Co. addressed them likewise vide P.194. More than all, all the invoices were issued in the name the London Branch of the Essenflour Products Co. Ltd. vide P.335, P.349, D.256 to D.401. Thus the contention that K.B. Mavliankar was a sub-agent appointed with the knowledge of the principal etc. cannot be upheld. page 262 of Exh.P.142. Essenflour general ledger contains a separate page for the 'London Office account'.

#### Banking arrangements in London.

The agreement between the agents and the Government from the very commencement was that all sale-proceeds received on behalf of Government less commission and expenses due to the agent should be credited to the Government account with Messrs Coutts & Co. without any delay and not less than once a week. In his letter Exh.P.65 dated 29-8-25 Mr. Sitharamachari wrote to Mr. Vardhamania about banking arrangements. the ~~agreements~~ which he was making with Messrs Coutts & Co. so as 'to create the greatest possible confidence both among buyers and the Mysore Government'. In that letter he wrote:

"In regard to the sales realisations all monies will be paid to Messrs. Coutts & Co. to the account of





General and Revenue  
Secretariat.

File No. 6 of 1928.

Serial  
No.

Letter no: 97 dated 5.8.28 from PPr  
supra forwarding a Vakalat to be  
by the Chief Secretary

The PPr sends a Vakalat for the signature  
of the Chief Secretary. He promises to send the  
draft written statement at an early date.  
The PPr wants Rs 5/- for the incidental expenses of  
the case. The suit relates to the Revenue Department  
which under Rule 130 of the legal affairs rules,  
has to meet the charge.

MOP

Secy)

2  
7/8

Chief Secy

with Compl<sup>s</sup> for favour of  
Signing the Vakalat & sending Rs

8/-  
5/8

MOP

Draft Vakalat

MOP

11/8  
13/8

It is not clear who  
has to send the Rs 5/-  
required by the PPr.

MOP  
11/8  
13/8

MOP

13/8

seen & submitted with  
note as to whether the PPr  
provided with any imp-est &  
meeting with expenses.

2

13/8

ISSUE  
&  
RESUBMIT.

To the P Pr Mysore

MOP 1094 5/14.8.28

Returns the Vakalat duly signed by  
Chief Secy

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

General and Revenue  
Secretariat.

File No. 6 of 1926.

Serial  
No.

Under 18 Courts of Law of the Current year best  
provision is made for contingencies of the Govt.  
Advocate and none for the Public Prosecutors.  
It is for orders as to who has to meet the amount  
of Rs 5/- required by the P.P. for incidental  
expenses connected with his suit.

me  
14/8/28  
14/8

The Rev. Dept. has to  
pay the amount required  
to P.P.

Secy

Chief Secy  
with Compl

14/5

8/5/28  
16/8

16/8  
16/8

Draft Subd for approval  
or other orders

17/8/28 Ch. Secy 17/8

Supply note to R. to  
advance the amount from his mch.

CHIEF SECRETARY  
17 AUG. 1928

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

18/8

WD 01714—GPE—30,000—18-4-28

General and Revenue  
Secretariat.

New File No. 6 of 1928.

Serial  
No.

20

The R.C.

No. 1535-7/18.8.28

Requests him to send Rs 5/- out  
of his pocket -

20 Poo. Branch

with -

in  
21/8/28

7

Letter no 133 of 28.29 dated 17th August  
1928 from P.P., Mysore seeking instructions on  
two points mentioned therein.Letter no 135 of 28.29 from the same Office  
to the Chief Secy requesting that notice sent under  
Sec 80 C.D.C. may be forwarded to him -

The two points raised by the P.P. are

- (1) Whether the Suit is not barred under  
Sec 221 cl(f) of the Madras Revenue Code
- & (2) whether under the circumstances mentioned  
the R.C. Mr. D'Souza was competent to  
reverse the orders of his predecessor?

As regards (1) the R.C. in his report (flap 2)  
H) says that the Suit is barred under cl(f)

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

General and Revenue  
Secretariat.

Law File No. 6 of 1928.

Serial  
No.

of sec 22/ A.R.C which ousts the Jurisdiction  
Civil Courts from taking Cognisance of Suits rela  
"Claims against government respecting the  
occupation of waste or vacant land belonging  
to Govt". Since this is a suit of such a nature  
it seems to be ~~based~~ not maintainable.

As regards point no (2), the A.C, Mr.  
D'Souza can be said to have reviewed the  
order of his predecessor and since his order has been  
upheld by Govt as per Govt order of 26-11-27  
(filed 8), the point whether Mr. D'Souza had to  
to review the order of his predecessor does not ~~also~~  
seem to be very material

The P.P. wants the notice under sec 80C  
served by the Plaintiff before suit. It is fluff  
and is no more than the copy of the plaint filed  
in the suit. If approved the P.P. will be  
informed accordingly.

Submitted to A.R.

DDP  
22/8/28

Refer him to 14 Mys. Ch. Ct R. 255

8-1  
24.8  
2

Draft put up.

DDP  
25/8/28

appd  
8-1  
25/8  
2

25/8  
2

Serial  
No.

8

To the P P Mysore  
DOP 1338 D 31-8-28

Furnishes the opinion on the point  
raised in the letter

Sus  
Mf  
1.9.28

9. Letter No. C. 2865 / 27. 28 dated 7/ Sept  
1928 from Rev: Comr, suggesting a reply to  
the letter of the PPr, Mysore enquiring  
information on certain points to facilitate  
him to draft the written statement.

Submitted- A reply practically on the lines  
suggested by the R.C. has already been sent  
to the PPr, Mysore in this office letter no. P133  
of 31-8-28 (Flag N).

Mf

8.9.28  
Mf  
10/9

A copy of this letter may  
also be forwarded to the PPr in  
continuation. Please prepare a d/c  
in  
8/10

Draft put at

Mf

ch/pe

seen in

10/9

10 To the P Pr Mysore.

DOP 1579 D 12/9/28

Had a copy of letter recd from  
the Rev Comm in the matter

Serial  
No.

11. Letter No: 193 of 28.29 from PPr Shyore,  
forwarding the written statement in O.S. 1.  
for signature of Chief Secy:

The statement is prepared on the  
noted in this office letter no: P1338 dated 27,  
August 1928 (filed N) - This may be aff  
Submitted to Chief Secy for signature.

Pop

13.9.28  
Pop  
1819

L.R.)

W. S. slightly revised -

affd.

W. S. maybe signed & returned

Chief Secy?  
with Compl.

1819

Approved & returned  
1819

24th  
1819

CHIEF SECRETARY  
15 SEP 1928

Draft return

Pop  
1819  
1820

Recd  
1819

12 To the P. Pr Shyore  
POP 1751 D. 20.9.28

Returns the written statement as  
signed by the Chief Secy as well as the  
copy of the statement

Ses  
Pop  
25.9.28

SUBJECT.....  
.....  
.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

Section *Law*  
File No. *6-28*  
Serial No. *2*

No. *7800*

General and Revenue Secretariat  
( )  
the 192

To *The District Judge*  
*Mysore*

Date of issue..... *3/8/28*

Sir,

Signed by..... *M. N. S.*

~~With~~ I am directed to  
acknowledge <sup>the</sup> receipt of ~~the~~  
Your letter no: 198 dated  
<sup>addressed to the Chief Secy</sup>  
25-7-1928, forwarding a  
copy of the plaint in  
O.S. 1 of 27-28 on the file  
of your Court.

List of enclosures.....

*I have etc*

Copied by .....

*2* Secretary to Govt  
*Mr Lawrence*

Examined by .....

*over 28/7/28*  
*M. N. S.*

SUBJECT.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

the

192

Date of issue.....

Signed by.....

Section *Law*

File No. *6-28*

Serial No. *3*

No. *7801 Mysore*

To *The Public Prosecutor  
Mysore.*

Sir,

I have the honour to request  
you to appear on behalf of  
the Government in O.S. 1 of  
27-28 (Mallepowda v Nanjeyowda  
and Chief Secretary) on the file  
of the District Court, Mysore  
which is posted for hearing  
to 13<sup>th</sup> August 1928.

A copy of the plaint served  
on the Chief Secretary and  
herewith sent. the file

over

of papers relating to the  
are are herewith sent.

You are requested to <sup>send</sup> ~~prepare~~  
a draft written statement  
~~and~~ for approval and signature  
of the Chief Secretary

I have etc

 Secretary to Govt  
Mr. Law Dept  
24/7/20  
for  
28/1-

From

591  
6-8-28-3  
The Public Prosecutor

Government Pleader, Mysore.

To

The Chief Secretary to  
Government of Mysore, Bangalore.

Dated 5th August 1928.

no., 97 of '28-'29.

Enclosure:- 1


Sir,

I have the honour to  
state that the Secretary to  
Government, Law Department, has  
sent me with his office letter  
no., P 801 / Law dated 3-8-'28,  
the copy of the plaint in O.S.  
no., 1 of '28-'29 (Hallegowda  
VS.  
Hanlegowda and Chief Secretary)  
which is for hearing on the 13th  
instant before the District Judge  
Mysore, together with the file  
of papers relating to the case


CHIEF SECRETARY,  
6 AUG. 1928

2  
618

and has requested me to appear on your behalf in the case and send the draft written statement & for your approval and signature. I shall draft the written statement after perusal of the records and send it to you within a short time. But in the meanwhile, the vakalat form herewith sent may kindly be signed by you in the place marked therein and returned to me before the 13th instant with a sum of Rs 5/- for the incidental expenses of the case.

I have the honour to be  
Sir,  
Your most obedient servant,  
  
Public Prosecutor & Govt. Pleader,  
A y s o r e.

SUBJECT.....



Diary No. of letter replied to.....

Section *Law*

File No. *6.28.*

Serial No. *5*

No.

*1094(1)*

General and Revenue Secretariat

the

192

To

*The Public Prosecutor  
Mysore*

Date of issue.....

*14/87-4*

*Sir,*

Signed by.....

*M. N. S.*

*With reference to your letter*

*No. 97 of 28-29 dated 5<sup>th</sup> August*

*1928 in the matter of O.S.*

*1 of 28-29 (Hallepouda v Naye-*

*fouda and Chief Secretary), in*

*the District Court, Mysore, I have*

*the honour to return herewith*

*the Vavalat duly signed*

*by the Chief Secretary*

*I have etc*

List of enclosures.....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

*over*

*M.  
for Secy.*

*over*

SUBJECT.....

Section

~~2~~ 6 of 21

File No.

Serial No. 6

No. R 1535

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

the

192

To

The R.C.

Date of issue.....

18-8-28

Signed by.....

Mr. N. V. I.

List of enclosures.....

Copied by .....

Gm<sup>2</sup>  
(8) 8/28

Examined by .....

Sir

The P. P of Mysore  
wants an advance of Rs 5/-  
to meet the incidental  
expenses connected with  
the suit (G.S. 10627-28)  
filed by Mallappa  
against Rangegonda &  
Govt in the Dist Court  
at Mysore in connection  
with certain lands given  
to him in Rangapur  
A.M. Kanak in Asikere  
Taluk of Jan directed  
over

to request<sup>n</sup> to send the  
sum out of your interest —  
to be adjusted  
one corner

Thank to

~~MS~~  
18/8  
Ask Chief Teey

PM

No. 1536 7/18-8-28

Copy to PP. In person for  
info

~~MS~~

192

From

The Public Prosecutor &  
Government Pleader, Mysore.

To

The Secretary to Government  
Law Department, Bangalore.

Dated 17th August 1928.

Despatched

Received

General No. 133/28-29  
No.

Enclosure No.

---

Subject:- O.C.no., 1 of '28-'29

Mallegowda VB. Chief Secretary to  
Govt. of Mysore

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your communication no., 801 Law, dated 3-8-'28 with its enclosures. I have carefully read the plaint and the file of papers sent. Before I proceed to draft the written statement, in answer to the plaint, I shall feel obliged if I am enlightened on the undernoted points :-

(1) Plaintiff Mallegowda seeks the aid of the District Judge, for setting aside an order passed by Government regarding the disposal of Kaval lands, got by surrender from the Amritmahal Department. This Kaval land was admittedly in the

possession of the Revenue authorities on behalf of Government as waste or vacant land. When Government have passed final orders regarding the disposal or occupation of such waste or vacant land, is not the action of Government protected by section 221 Land Revenue code and does not clause (f) of section 221 operate as a bar to the institution of a civil suit; in other words, must the jurisdiction of a civil court to sit in judgment over the propriety or otherwise of the action of Government ?

(2) It cannot be denied that Plaintiff Mallegowda was given a saguvali chit by the Amildar on 15-2-27, and it was only after the appeal of Nanjegowda on 21-2-'27 that Mallegowda's possession was disturbed and the sale in his favour was set aside by the Revenue Commissioner on 16-5-'27. This order of the Revenue Commissioner was confirmed by Government in November 1927. But as per Government Order no., 410-P.F.157-02 dated 10-10-1903, sales once properly conducted should not be set aside, or rather resales should not be ordered, simply on the ground that after the sale is closed, a third party offers a higher bid. In the case under consideration, Mallegowda gave his Darkast on 12-6-26 and the Revenue Commissioner accepted the offer of Mallegowda on 27-1-'27 and directed the lands to be delivered to him, subject to the usual conditions. Accordingly Mallegowda discharged his portion of the obligation and got in turn the Saguvali chit, above referred to, on 15-2-27.

Nanjegowda's offer was first made only on 1-12-'26, that is, nearly 5½ months after Mallegowda's Darkast. It is true that before the actual acceptance of the offer of Mallegowda, the Darkast of Nanjegowda was pending and was not brought to the notice of the Revenue Commissioner at the time of his order in January 1927. Can this circumstance be construed as being enough to revise the original order and to set aside the sale in favour of Mallegowda in the light of the above referred Government order of 1903 ?

I have sent a copy of this communication both to the Revenue Commissioner and to the Deputy Commissioner of Hassan, to oblige me with their instructions, if any.

I have the honour to be  
Sir,  
Your most obedient servant,  
Sd/- M. Sreenivasa Iyengar.  
Public Prosecutor & Govt. Pleader,  
Mysore.

CHIEF SECRETARY  
20 AUG 1928

No. 135/28-29

Copy of the above is forwarded with compliments to the Chief Secretary to Govt. of Mysore in Bangalore, with a request that the notice stated to have been issued to him by plaintiff Mallegowda before the institution of the suit may be sent to me to enable me to know whether the same satisfies the requirements of Sec. 80 of the Civil Procedure Code Regulation.

M. Sreenivasa Iyengar  
Public Prosecutor & Govt. Pleader,  
Mysore.

192

From

The Public Prosecutor &  
Government Pleader, Mysore.

To

The Secretary to Government,  
Law Department, Bangalore.

Dated 17th August 1928.

Despatched

Received

General No. /33/28-29,  
No.

Enclosure No.

*S. N. W.*  
Subject:- O.S.no., 1 of '28-'29

Mallegowda VS. Chief Secretary to  
Govt. of Mysore

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your communication no., 801 Law, dated 3-8-'28 with its enclosures. I have carefully read the plaint and the file of papers sent. Before I proceed to draft the written statement, in answer to the plaint, I shall feel obliged if I am enlightened on the undernoted points :-

(1) Plaintiff Mallegowda seeks the aid of the District Judge, for setting aside an order passed by Government regarding the disposal of Kaval lands, got by surrender from the Amritmahal Department. This Kaval land was admittedly in the

possession of the Revenue authorities on behalf of Government as waste vacant land. When Government have passed final orders regarding the disposal or occupation of such waste or vacant land, is not the action of Government protected by section 221 Land Revenue code and does not clause f) of section 221 operate as a bar to the institution of a civil suit; or in other words, oust the jurisdiction of a civil court to sit in Judgment over the propriety or otherwise of the action of Government ?

(2)\* It cannot be denied that Plaintiff Mallegowda was given a saguvali chit by the Amildar on 15-2-27, and it was only after the appeal of Panjegowda on 21-2-'27 that Mallegowda's possession was disturbed and the sale in his favour was set aside by the Revenue Commissioner on 16-5-'27. This order of the Revenue Commissioner was confirmed by Government in November 1927. But as per Government Order no., 410-P.F.157-02 dated 10-10-1903, sales once properly conducted should not be set aside, or rather resales should not be ordered, simply on the ground that after the sale is closed, a third party offers a higher bid. In the case under consideration, Mallegowda gave his Barkast on 12-6-26 and the Revenue Commissioner accepted the offer of Mallegowda on 27-1-'27 and directed the lands to be delivered to him, subject to the usual conditions. Accordingly Mallegowda discharged his portion of the obligation and got in turn the Saguvali chit, above referred to, on 15-2-27.

Nanjegowda's offer was first made only on 1-12-'26, that is, nearly 5½ months after Mallegowda's Darkast. It is true that before the actual acceptance of the offer of Mallegowda, the Darkast of Nanjégowda was pending and was not brought to the notice of the Revenue Commissioner at the time of his order in January 1927. Can this circumstance be construed as being enough for Mr.D.Souza - the then Revenue Commissioner, to revise the order of his predecessor in office and to set aside the sale in favour of Mallegowda in the light of the above referred Government order of 1903 ?

I have sent a copy of this communication both to the Revenue Commissioner and to the Deputy Commissioner of Hassan, to oblige me with their instructions, if any.

I have the honour to be  
Sir,  
Your most obedient servant,

*W. Anandam, Bangalore*  
Public Prosecutor & Govt. Pleader,  
Mysore.

SUBJECT.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

Section

File No.

Serial No. 8

No.

General and Revenue Secretariat

the

192

To

The Public Prosecutor  
Mysore.

Date of issue.....

31/3/28

Sir,

Signed by.....

M. N. S.

With reference to your letter

No 133/28-29 dated 17th August 1928,

regarding O.S. 1 of 28-29 (Halleyson

vs Chief Secretary), I have the honor

to state that clause (f) of section

221 of the Land Revenue Code,

clearly vests the jurisdiction of

Civil Courts from entertaining

"Claims against Government

respecting the occupation of waste

or vacant land belonging to

Government". The ruling

over

List of enclosures.....

Copied by .....

M. N. S.

Examined by .....

14 Mysore Inf Const Reports 255  
as be referred to in the matter

As regards the second  
out your case, I invite  
your attention to the fact  
that the Revenue Commissioner's  
~~order~~ Mr. D'Sonza's order  
~~has been~~  
~~as been~~ upheld by Government  
~~is~~ was upheld in appeal  
of Government and as such  
the question whether he had the  
power to revise the order of  
his predecessor does not arise.

The notice under sec 80  
P.C sent by the party before  
it is no more than an exact  
copy of the plaint filed in the  
it and as such therefore  
is forwarded to you ~~now~~ as  
requested in your letter no: 135/20.29  
The Chief Secretary

I have etc

Secy to Govt.

No. C.2865/27-28.

OFFICE OF THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER  
IN MYSORE,

Dated Bangalore, 2nd September.....1928

FROM

P. G. D'SOUZA, Esq., B.A., B.L.,  
REVENUE COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE.

7  
Law 6.28.9

TO

The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the Government  
of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,  
Law Department, Bangalore.

SIR,

With reference to letter No.136/28-29 dated 17th August 1928, from the Public Prosecutor and Government Pleader, Mysore to the Secretary to Government, Law Department( copy of which was forwarded by the Public Prosecutor to this office) asking for instructions on certain points for drafting the written statement in O.S.1/28-29 (Mallegowda -Vs- Chief Secretary to Government) in the District Court, Mysore, I have the honour to state that it has already been reported to Government that the Civil Courts have no jurisdiction in the case vide Clause F, Section 221 Land Revenue Code. As such discussion does not arise in the Civil Court on the merits of a decision which is entirely within the competence of the Revenue Courts and therefore point (2) raised in the Public Prosecutor's letter does not arise at all.

2. Even going to the merits of the decision of Government in this case, it will be seen that the Government Order No.410-P.W. 157-02 dated 10th October 1903 referred to by the Public Prosecutor applies only to sales in auction and not to grants of land for an upset price as in the present case.

3. The reasons which induced the Government to set aside the original grant and order as it has done in this case are noted in the order itself and no Civil Court is competent to test the correctness or otherwise of the decision of Government vide Section 221, Clause (F) Land Revenue Code.

- 4 -

4. I am of opinion that a reply may be sent to the  
Public Prosecutor on the above lines.

I have the honour to be,

S i r,

Your most obedient servant,

*H. Hanman* 6/5/8  
Assistant Commissioner,  
For Revenue Commissioner.  
Absent from the station.

SUBJECT.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 192

Date of issue.....

Signed by.....

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

Section

File No. 6-28

Serial No. /0

No.

To

The Public Prosecutor  
Mysore

Sir,

In continuation of this office no.

P 1338/daw 6-28-8 dated 31-8-1928

furnishing the opinion of the legal  
Remembrancer on certain pointsin connection with the drafting of the  
written statement in O.S. 1 of 28-29(Mallegowda v Chief Secy), in the  
District Court, Mysore, I have the  
honour to forward for your

information the copy of the letter

no. C 2865/27-18 dated 2/7 Sept<sup>r</sup>received  
1928 from the Revenue Commissioner  
in Mysore

over

DMD

For Secy to Govt  
Law Dept

From

1168728  
P828

The Public Prosecutor &  
Government Pleader, Mysore.  
To

The Legal Remembrancer  
& Secretary to Government, Law  
Department, Bangalore.

Dated 7th September 1928

No., 193 of 28-29

Enclosure:- 1 draft written  
statement and plaint copy.

Sir,

I have the honour to  
send you herewith the copy of  
the plaint in O.S.no., 1/28-29  
(Mallegowda VS. Nanjegowda and  
Chief Secretary to Government)  
of District Judge's court,  
Mysore, along with the defence  
statement of the 2nd defendant  
which has been prepared by me  
on the lines noted in your  
office letter no., P 1338 Law6

Law 6-28-11

28-8 dated 27/31-8-28. The enclosures may be returned after you approve of the defence statement sent herewith.

The case comes on for hearing on the 24th instant.

*The signature of the Chief Secretary may kindly be secured, before returning the W.S. to me*

I have the honour to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

*Ludman Angila*

Public Prosecutor & Govt. Pleader,  
M y s o r e.

SUBJECT.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

the

192

Date of issue.....

Signed by.....

List of enclosures.....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

Section

File No.

Serial No.

No.

To

Sir

With reference to your

letter No 193 of 28.29 dated 7th

September 1928 regarding O.S.

1 of 28.29 (Mallegowda v

Naujeowda & Chief Secy)

in the file of the District Judge, Mysore  
I am directed to return

herewith the written statement

duly signed by the Chief Secretary,

as well as the copy of the

plaint sent with your letter

under reply - Mavech

over